

REMARKS

I. Introduction

In response to the Office Action dated March 3, 2006, claims 1, 14 and 27 have been amended. Claims 1, 3-14, 16-27, and 29-39 remain in the application. Re-examination and re-consideration of the application, as amended, is requested.

II. Double Patenting Rejection

In paragraphs (4)-(5) of the Office Action, claims 3-14, 16-27 and 29-39 were provisionally rejected on the grounds of non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 2-48 of co-pending application number 09/534,757 (Sweet 757) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,956,715 (Glasser).

Applicants' attorney submits herewith a Terminal Disclaimer and Certificate under 37 C.F.R. §3.73(b) to overcome this rejection.

III. Prior Art Rejections

In paragraphs (6)-(7) of the Office Action, claims 1, 3-14, 16-27, and 29-39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Doherty, "Project specific Web Sites", from Interiors, Vol. 157, March 1998, in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,956,715 (Glasser).

Specifically, on page 8 of the Office Action, in the section entitled "Response to Arguments," the Office Action states the following:

8. The Examiner would like to point out that the indication of allowable subject matter found within the limitations in previous claims 2, 15, and 28, now incorporated in the independent claims, is withdrawn upon further consideration. Applicant cancelled objected claims 2, 15, 28, and included said claims into their respective independent claims. Upon the examiner's further review of the newly formed independent claims, the claims fail to overcome the prior art rejection of Doherty in view of Glasser.

More specifically, the Doherty reference provides project specific web sites, which are interactive web sites, adopted by architectural organizations. Doherty provides a project specific website with members, security, a project directory, an electronic file cabinet of document (specs, CAD, product information), online forms and logs (RFT's, revisions, etc.). The Doherty reference, which provides a generic template for an interactive website that is project specific fails to explicitly state the utilization of an API for obtaining a connection across the internet; however, the Glasser reference uses an API for maintaining connections across a network. Furthermore, the reference discloses a method for establishing or manipulating access controls for particular network resources, such as files and file folders or

directories in a hierarchical file storage system associated with a server computer. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art having the teachings of Doherty and Glasser before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the architectural project information and access methods taught by Doherty to include the API methods and folder access techniques of Glasser because it would have provided the author the advantage of easy, user-friendly navigation across the web site and establishing access restrictions to files stored in a project folder.

Finally, the examiner would like to point out the claim language found within independent claim 1 of Sweat 757 that states, 'wherein project related administration tasks are available if a user is working with the project folders and such project related administration tasks are not available when working with the standard folders' narrowly defined the claim and overcame the rejection of Doherty in view of Glasser in the co-pending application. Without any such mention within the currently amended claim, the limitations within the independent claims do not preclude the user from maintaining the prior art rejection of Doherty in view of Glasser.

Applicants' attorney has amended the independent claims to include the indicated limitation.

Thus, Applicants' attorney submits that independent claims 1, 14 and 27 are allowable over Doherty and Glasser. Further, dependent claims 3-13, 16-26 and 29-39 are submitted to be allowable over Doherty and Glasser in the same manner, because they are dependent on independent claims 1, 14 and 27, respectively, and thus contain all the limitations of the independent claims. In addition, dependent claims 3-13, 16-26 and 29-39 recite additional novel elements not shown by Doherty and Glasser.

IV. Conclusion

In view of the above, it is submitted that this application is now in good order for allowance and such allowance is respectfully solicited.

Should the Examiner believe minor matters still remain that can be resolved in a telephone interview, the Examiner is urged to call Applicants' undersigned attorney.


Respectfully submitted,

GATES & COOPER LLP
Attorneys for Applicants

Howard Hughes Center
6701 Center Drive West, Suite 1050
Los Angeles, California 90045
(310) 641-8797

Date: June 5, 2006

GHG/

By: 
Name: George H. Gates
Reg. No.: 33,500

G&C 30566.107-US-11